

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/600,888	08/15/2000	Kingo Suzuki	P107242-0000	4637
	7590 07/20/2007 Arent Fox Kintner		EXAMINER	
Plotkin & Kahn	•••		TRINH, HOA B	
Suite 600 1050 Connection	out Avenue NW		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	Washington, DC 20036-5339		2814	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/20/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	09/600,888	SUZUKI ET AL.	
	Examiner	A -4 11-14	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Vikki H. Trinh	2814	

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence a	ddress
THE REPLY FILED <u>28 June 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid a this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evid places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 appears for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CER 1.114. The continued Examination (RCE) is compliance with 37 CER 1.114. The continued Examination (RCE) is compliance with 37 CER 1.114.	lence, which CFR 41.31; or (3)
a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within o time periods:	ne of the following
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final reje	ection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the approphave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Cost for formally set in the final Cost formally in the final cost formally set for the final rejection may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL	opriate extension fee Office action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two mo filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).	nths of the date of the appeal. Since
AMENDMENTS	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered	l because
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying	ig the issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	
	(DTOL 004)
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendments.	nt (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendinon-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	ment canceling the
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	n explanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:	
Claim(s) objected to Claim(s) rejected: 7,11 and 13.	
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	not be entered is necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brie entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(c)	fails to provide a d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or atta REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	ached.
11.   The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allow See Continuation Sheet.	vance because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).	•
13.	
HOWA	RDWEISS V EXAMINER

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants have proposed to amend claim 7 which is a device claim to include a method step limitation that has been rejected in the previous Office Action in claim 11. accordinly, the newly proposed claim 7 includes a rejectable product-by-process limitation under MPEP section 2113. Thus, the proposed amendment does not place the application in condition for allowance.

HOWARD WEISS PRIMARY EXAMINER